

REMARKS

Claims 4-7 remain in this application, and new claims 8-9 are added above. Claims 1-3 were previously canceled. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Independent claim 4 is again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Gregory et al. and Dinkel et al. patents. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 4 above defines the vehicle seat cushion as including channels passing through an entire core thickness of a cushion core and, at second ends, opening out freely on an outer face of the cushion core directed away from said grooves, and a fan that sucks air in from an area surrounding the cushion to provide air flow out through those second ends of at least some of said channels. The features now reflected by claim 4 are evident from Figures 2 and 4 and described in paragraphs 0019-0021 of the substitute specification, for example.

It is respectfully submitted that the invention now defined by claim 4 above is not obvious in view of the Gregory et al. and Dinkel et al. disclosures. Various channels 14 (Figure 1) and 121 (Figure 3) are shown as passing through vehicle seat foam material in the Gregory et al. arrangement, but neither the channel 14 nor any of the channels 121 has air flow out through a second end that opens out freely on an outer face of the cushion core directed away from grooves as claim 4 above particularly defines. The Dinkel et al. patent shows fans 23 in ducts 24 for blowing air into a ventilation layer 18. As described in column 3, lines 56-59 of the Dinkel et al. patent, when the Dinkel et al. seat is

unoccupied, air flows through the upholstery cover 20 into the air space above the sat surface. When the Dinkel et al. seat is occupied, however, air moves along in the ventilation layer 18 and flows out again at open ends of the upholstery 13 as described in column 3, lines 59-61 of the Dinkel et al. patent. Neither of these sections of the Dinkel et al. patent suggests air flow out through a second channel end that opens out freely on an outer face of the cushion core directed away from grooves as claim 4 particularly defines.

It is respectfully submitted that, for reasons discussed, the Gregory et al. and Dinkel et al. patent disclosures, considered together, fail to suggest a cushion for a vehicle seat meeting the limitations in claim 4 discussed above, and that claim 4 above is patentable as a result. The rest of the claims now present in this application are dependent claims and are considered patentable as well.

This application should now be in allowable condition. If there are any questions regarding this Reply or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an extension of time sufficient to effect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #095309.56028US).

Date: April 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Richard R. Diefendorf
Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
RRD:rd